



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/851,415		05/09/2001	Shunpei Yamazaki	12732-036001/US4906	1902	
26171	7590	01/14/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. 1425 K STREET, N.W.				KOVALICK, VINCENT E		
11TH FLOO	,	•		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHING	TON, DO	20005-3500	2673			
				DATE MAILED: 01/14/200	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	n No.	Applicant(s)					
	_	09/851,41	5	YAMAZAKI ET AL.					
	Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit					
		Vincent E	Kovalick	2673					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply									
A SHO THE! - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failur Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA asions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) are period for reply is specified above, the maximum statute the to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, reply received by the Office later than three months after ad patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION. 7 CFR 1.136(a). In no eve cation. ays, a reply within the statuory period will apply and with by statute, cause the apple.	nt, however, may a reply be tin tory minimum of thirty (30) day I expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cation to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely, the mailing date of this cor D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nmunication.				
Status									
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed of	on 18 October 2004	1 .						
•	☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.								
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Dispositi	on of Claims								
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)□	 ✓ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. ✓ Claim(s) 1-38,40 and 41 is/are allowed. ✓ Claim(s) 39 is/are rejected. ✓ Claim(s) is/are objected to. ✓ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 								
Applicati	on Papers								
10)	The specification is objected to by the E The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objectio Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the The oath or declaration is objected to by) accepted or b) n to the drawing(s) b e correction is require	e held in abeyance. Seed if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFI					
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.									
2) Notice 3) Inform	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO- nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTo r No(s)/Mail Date		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Di 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate	·152)				

Art Unit: 2673

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office Action is in response to Applicant's Amendment and Request for Continued Examination dated October 18, 2004, to USPTO Final Office Action dated June 16, 2004.

Applicant's remarks relative to claim 39 are rendered moot in light of the amendment to claim 39. Claim 39 stands rejected based on the teachings of the prior art as set forth hereinbelow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harkin (USP 6,327,376) taken with Soini et al (USP 6,445,932) in view of Umeya (USP 6,028,581).

 Relative to claim 39, Harkin **teaches** an electronic apparatus comprising a fingerprint sensing device (col. 2, lines 39-67; col. 3, lines 1-67; col. 4, lines 10-67 and col. 5, lines 1-30); Harkin further **teaches** a mobile information communication device (col. 10, lines 1-28 and Figs. 7-8); and a liquid crystal display(LCD) device (item 70 in Figs. 7-8) provided in said mobile information communication device; said liquid crystal.

Art Unit: 2673

respective pixels.

Harkin does not specifically teach said liquid crystal display including a pixel portion having a plurality of pixels, each of said pixels comprising: a pixel thin film transistor having a source region, a drain region and a gate electrode; a source signal line connected to the source region; a liquid crystal element and a storage capacitor connected to the drain region; a gate signal line connected to the gate electrode; and a capacitance line connected to the storage capacitors, said pixel portion as described being well known in the makeup of liquid crystal display devices. Because said structure is in common practice and well know in the art, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that said pixel panel as described hereinabove would have been included in the LCD as taught by Harkin. Harkin does not teach a flash memory, wherein said LCD comprises photo diodes provided for respective pixels, and wherein individual information of a user is stored in said flash memory. Harken teaches an electronic apparatus comprising a LCD and a finger print sensing device. Soini et al. teaches a multi-service mobile station (col. 2, lines 32-67 and col. 3, lines 1-45); Soini et al. further teaches a flash memory wherein individual information of a user is stored in said flash memory (col. 6, lines 65-67 and col. 7, lines 1-8); It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the device as taught by Harkin the feature as taught by Soini et al. in order to provide a nonvolatile storage means for storing data secured from being accidentally purged.

Harkin taken with Soini et al. does not teach said LCD comprising photo diodes provided for

Art Unit: 2673

Harkin taken with Soini et al. teaches a liquid crystal device provided in a mobile information communication device wherein the said LCD comprises photo diodes provided for respective pixels.

Umeya teaches an apparatus for a Liquid Crystal Display having an input function (col. 2, lines 55-67 and col. 3, lines 1-10); Umeya further teaches said LCD comprising photo diodes provided for respective pixels col. 2, lines 55-67).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the device as taught by Harkin taken with Soini et al. the feature as taught by Umeya in order to provide a solid state image display device that lends itself to application in miniature hand-held electronic devices.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 4. Claims 1-38 and 40-41 allowed.
- 5. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Relative to claims 1, 3, 21, 23 and 40, the major difference between the teachings of the prior art of record (Harkin, USP 6,327,376; Soini, USP 6,445,932 and Umeya, USP 6,028,581) and that of the instant invention is that said prior art of record **does not teach** a built in image sensor, or an image sensor constructed of photo diodes comprising a first thin film transistor having a first source region, a first drain region and a first gate electrode; a sensor gate signal line connected to the first gate electrode; a sensor output wiring connected to one of the first source and drain regions; a second thin film transistor having a second source region, a second drain region and a second gate electrode; a reset gate signal line connected to the second gate electrode; and a sensor power source line connected to the second drain region; a storage device; a module for

Art Unit: 2673

judging whether the user can be identified or not by comparing individual information read by said image sensor with individual information stored in said storage device and a module for transmitting a result of the authentication via the Internet; or a means for collating individual information read by said image sensor with user's individual information stored in a flash memory.

Regarding claims 26 and 36, the major difference between the teachings of the said prior art of record and that of the instant invention is that said prior art of record does not teach a user identity authentication method using a mobile information communication device provided with a liquid crystal display device having first and second front lights and comprising a built-in image sensor, said method comprising: a step of reading individual information of a use with said image sensor when the first front light is lit up; a step of displaying an image when the second front light is lit up; and a step of authenticating a user's identity based on said individual information or a step of transmitting said individual information via the Internet; wherein the first and second front lights are not lit up simultaneously.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U. S. Patent No. 6,456,279 Kubo et al.

U. S. Patent No. 6,476,374 Kozlowski et al.

U. S. Patent No. 6,070,796 Sibu

Page 6

Application/Control Number: 09/851,415

Art Unit: 2673

Responses

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vincent E Kovalick whose telephone number is 703 306-3020. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30- 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on 703 305-4938. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600